18 P.-B. Lafont, 'Inventaire des manuscrits des pagodes du Laos', *BEFEO* 52, 1964–65, pp. 429–45.

19 L. Finot, 'Recherches sur la littérature Laotienne', *BEFEO* 17, 1917, pp. 1–218.

20 *Catalogue of palm leaf texts in Wat Libraries in Chiang Mai (Thailand)*. Parts I–IV. 1974–75.

21 *A Catalogue of Lan Na Manuscripts. Microfilm Copies in the Social Research Institute*. Chiang Mai, 2525 (1982) [mimeographed], 341 pages.

22 O. von Hinüber, 'Pāli manuscripts of canonical texts from North Thailand', *Journal of the Siam Society* 71, 1983, pp. 75–88.

23 Cf. F. R. Hamm, 'Zu einigen neueren Ausgaben des Pāli-Tipiṭaka', *ZDMG* 112, 1962, pp. 353–78.

24 G. Cœdès: *The Vajirañāṇa National Library*. Bangkok, 1924, pp. 21–24.

25 Cf. L. Finot, 'S.A.R. Le Prince Damrong', *Journal Asiatique* 1930, pp. 274–79.

26 W. A. de Silva, *op. cit.* (in n. 15), No. 70. Unfortunately this *Sāratthappakāsinī* manuscript cannot be traced in the National Library at present [1984].

27 See O. von Hinüber, *op. cit.* (in n. 22), p. 83.

# PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES III[1]

## TEN PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

The task of preparing the second edition of PED[2] continues. Here are a few more words which are either omitted from PED, or wrongly explained there.

### 1. *asita* 'unattached, unfettered'

PED (s.v. *asita*[2]) states that the word is to be derived from Skt *aśrita*, although CPD (s.v. *a-sita*[3]) states that it is a cross between *aśrita* and *asita*. PED lists *sita*[3] (from *sinoti* 'to bind') = 'bound' (from Skt *sita*, but it adds 'Perhaps as *sita*[2] [from *śrita*]'. It lists no occurrences of the uncompounded word, but gives two compounds with this derivation. It is not easy to see why some of the references given for *sita*[2] should not rather be under this heading.

At It 97,24* we find *asitaṃ sabbalokassa*, glossed as *taṇhādiṭṭhinissayānaṃ pahīnattā asitaṃ katthaci anissitaṃ* (It-a II 131,15–16), which indicates the commentator's belief in a connection with Skt *ni-śrita*. It is interesting to note that the parallel verse at G Dhp reads *asido sarvalokasya*, showing the Gāndhārī redactor's belief that the word was to be derived from Skt *asita*, not *aśrita*, which he would have written as *aśrida* or *aṣida*.

It cannot be stressed too much that this is *all* it shows. It is in no way *proof* that this interpretation is correct. There is evidence that in the Pāli tradition there was a commentarial tradition alongside the canon, going back in some cases to the time of the Buddha,[3] although there is no way of telling whether the *a-nissita* gloss is as ancient as this. If there was a similar commentarial tradition transmitted alongside the exemplar from which the Gāndhārī redactor made his translation, then it is possible that he was relying on that when he translated in the way he did. On the other hand, if there was no such commentarial tradition, then he was likely

to assume that the received *asita* was the equivalent of Skt *asita*, because Skt *aśrita* might have been expected to appear as *assita* in his exemplar.

Without further information about the reasons for translators translating in the way they do, we must always be wary when assessing the relative merits of translations of Buddhist texts. If we have different versions of a text in Pāli, Prakrit, Sanskrit, Chinese or Tibetan, there is no evidence that any one version is consistently superior to the others. When, as in the case of *asita*, we can deduce that the ambiguous form *asita* was in the exemplars underlying both the Pāli and the Prakrit version, and was variously interpreted by the two traditions, we may well have to admit that we have no valid reason for preferring either interpretation.

## 2. *cuṇṇa*- and *cuṇṇiya-pada* 'prose'

PED does not list the word *cuṇṇa*- compounded with *pada*, and does not list *cuṇṇiya* at all. The former occurs at Spk I 279,2: *gāthā bandhanto cuṇṇa-padāni karonto vicaranti*; III 49,21: *cuṇṇa-padehi vā gāthā-bandhena vā yattakaṃ sakkoti tattakaṃ vattabbaṃ*; Ud-a 415,3: *cuṇṇa-padehi gāthā-bandhehi yattakaṃ sakkoti tattakaṃ vattabbaṃ*. With reference to the last occurrence, the editor of Ud-a notes:[4] 'cf. Skt *kṣuṇṇa* (pounded, trodden)', and he makes a comparison with Sv 38 for the idea of *padas* of aromatic powder. He makes the same reference to Sv 38 in the footnote[5] to Spk I 279,2, but there seems to be nothing on that page which helps with the interpretation of the word.

The meaning of *cuṇṇiya-pada* can, in fact, easily be seen from Sadd, where it occurs frequently: *cuṇṇiya-padesv eva dissati na gāthāsu*, 190,6; *gāthāsu yeva dissati na cuṇṇiya-padesu*, 190,8; and elsewhere where it is contrasted with *gāthā*: 204,27; 205,1; 610,5,9,24; 628,2; 739,25,30; 740,5. It is clear that Helmer Smith is correct[6] in seeing a connection with Skt *cūrṇa* (quoted by MW[7] from Vāmana I.3.24) and *cūrṇaka* 'a kind of easy prose',[8] and in translating the word(s) as 'prose'.[9]

## 3. *nikkhamati* 'to protrude'

PED does not list the meaning 'protrude' for this word (s.v.), although it is, of course, merely a semantic development from the common meaning 'to go out'. The meaning 'protrude' is, however, clear from such contexts as: *mama imissā diṭṭhakālato paṭṭhāya kakkaṭassa viya akkhīni nikkhamiṃsu* (Dhp-a III 299,1–3) – 'from the time I saw her, my eyes protruded like a crab's', and: *akkhīhi nikkhantehi* (Ja II 59,26) – 'with protruding eyes'. We are probably to see the same meaning in the past participle in compounds, e.g. *nikkhanta-danta: asura-danto vā heṭṭhā vā upari vā bahi nikkhanta-danto* (Sp 1029,24) and *nikkhanta-dāṭha: tassa purohito piṅgalo nikkhanta-dāṭho ahosi* (Ja VI 245,17; cf. 246,7). The meaning is, therefore, not 'had lost all his teeth', as Rouse translates,[10] but 'with protruding teeth'. Doubtless the word at Ja VI 246,7 is an intrusion, inserted from the earlier passage, since this part of the brahman's description plays no further part in the story. The suggested translation is confirmed by the fact that at Ja V 91,24' we find *nikkhanta-danto* as a gloss upon *kaḷāro* (91,3*).[10a]

## 4. *paluṭṭha* 'mutilated'

PED does not list *paluṭṭha*. It occurs at Ud 22,21 in the compound *paluṭṭha-makkaṭī*, with the v.ll. *paluddha*-, *paludda*-, and *pasuddha*-. Woodward translates:[11] 'mutilated monkey'. The compound also occurs at Dhp-a I 118,25 in a very similar context. Burlingame translates:[12] 'a greedy monkey', presumably following the v.1. *paluddha*-. The oriental editions of both Ud and Dhp-a seem to prefer the reading *paluṭṭha*-,[13] and there seems to be no reason to reject this reading.

In a footnote the Ee of Ud gives a quotation[14] *paluṭṭha-makkaṭī ti jhāmaṅgamakkaṭī* from MS C, which is Ud-a, but the Ee of Ud-a does not include any gloss upon the word *paluṭṭha*-. It would seem that *jhāmaṅga*- is to be connected with the words *jhāmakkhette* and *jhāmakhāṇuke* 'in a burnt

field, on a burnt stump' which occur in the version of the story at Dhp-a I 118,24, and it would therefore mean 'with a burnt body, or limbs'. In conjunction with *kaṇṇa-nāsa-chinnā*, it seems appropriate that *paluṭṭha-* should have the meaning 'mutilated'.

If this is so, then a possible etymology suggests itself. It would be possible to derive the word from the Skt verb *lūṣ-* 'to injure', which is quoted by MW from the Dhātupāṭha[15] and was discussed at length by Burrow.[16]

## 5. *poso, pose* 'to a man'

PED notes (s.v. *posa*[1]) that at Ja III 331,8* the word *poso* in the genitive singular of *puṃs-*, and is therefore the equivalent of Skt *puṃsaḥ*. It would be very interesting to know why the editors of PED made this statement, since they do not give any reference to the identical passage at Ja II 52,6* and IV 425,27*. The commentary on Ja II 52,6* glosses *poso* as *satto* (II 52,8′), and is thus taking the word as nominative singular masculine. The commentary says nothing at the other two occurrences.

It is quite possible to take *poso* as a nominative in the verse:

> *yadā parābhavo hoti poso jīvitasaṃkhaye*
> *atha jālañ ca pāsañ ca āsajjâpi na bujjhati,*

although this involves the assumption that *atha* is not the first word of its clause, but that the sentence begins with the word *poso*. Although Francis and Neil translate Ja III 331,8* as 'when ruin comes upon a man',[17] which suggests that they were taking *poso* as an oblique case, the translators of the other Ja passages give no hint that they are doing so.[18] This may account for PED giving the one reference for the use of *poso* as a genitive.

It is an interesting fact that in a letter to Dines Andersen, Helmer Smith made a suggestion[19] about the word *pose* which occurs at Ja III 262,23*, and compared it with the genitive *poso* at Ja IV 425,27*. The relevant portion of the

verse is:

> *tasm' âhaṃ pose vipulā bhavāmi*
> *ūmī samuddassa yathâpi vaṇṇaṃ.*

The commentary explains: *tassâhaṃ pose ti tasmiṃ ahaṃ purise* – 'I am *vipulā* in respect of that man', but it is perhaps noteworthy that the lemma is *tass'* not *tasm'*, which is the reading found in the verse. It is also noteworthy that there is a v.1. *poso* for *pose* quoted from the MS C[ks]. If we read *tassâhaṃ poso*, we have another example of the genitive *poso*, agreeing with the genitive of the pronoun *tassa*. If the correct reading is *pose*, then we may assume that it is an Eastern form of *poso*, in agreement with *tassa*. It seems clear that the reading was *pose* at the time that the commentary was composed, and this was taken to be a locative form, and glossed as *purise*. The pronoun *tass'* was also taken to be a locative, and glossed as *tasmiṃ*. It would appear that this was done in a tradition which knew the Eastern form *tassi* < *tasmiṃ* (cf. the Aśokan form *tas[s]i*). At a later date the form *tass'* was 'corrected' in the text of the verse into *tasm'*, doubtless under the influence of the gloss *tasmiṃ*, but the original *tass'* was retained in the lemma.

The existence of the genitive form *pose* in *pāda* c gives a parallel to the genitive *samuddassa* in *pāda* d: 'I am *vipulā* to that man, just as *vaṇṇa* is *vipula* to the sea'. The final *pāda* of the verse presents difficulties, since it is by no means clear what case *ūmī* is, nor how it fits into the sentence, although we might suppose that *ūmī-samuddassa* is a compound, meaning 'the wavy sea'. Nor is the meaning of *vaṇṇa* certain. Francis and Neil suggested[20] that *vaṇṇa* is really for the Skt *vṛṃhan* 'increasing'. This suggestion can perhaps be safely ignored. Since the MSS read *vaṇṇa* for *vaṇṇu* at Vv 84,11, it might perhaps be suggested that *vaṇṇa* here is a mistake for *vaṇṇu*, and we could translate 'sand' (cf. *vaṇṇu-pathe ti vaṇṇu vuccati vālukā*, Ja I 109,18′ [ad 109,14*]).[21] This does not, however, help with *ūmī*, if it is not compounded with *samuddassa*. The commentary states: *ūmi samuddassa yathâpi vaṇṇan ti yathā nāma samuddassa vaṇṇaṃ olokentānaṃ uparūpari āgacchamānā ūmi vipulā khāyati, evam ahaṃ*

*tasmiṃ puggale vipulā homī ti dīpeti*. This explanation depends upon making *ūmi* the subject, but understanding *olokentānaṃ* '(to those looking at) the appearance of the sea'. This seems unlikely, and suggests that the commentary tradition did not know the correct interpretation of the verse.

## 6. *visaṃvādeti* 'to deceive with words'

PED (s.v.) gives the etymology of the word as *visaṃ* + *vādeti*. We find (s.v. *visaṃ*) that it is stated to be a Pāli prefix corresponding to Skt *viṣu* (or *visva°* in meaning 'diverging, on opposite sides') 'apart, against'; it is found only in the compound *°vādeti* and its derivations. Its literal meaning is said to be 'speak wrong, i.e. to deceive'. The same etymology of *visaṃ* + *vād-* is given for *visaṃvāda* and *visaṃvādaka*, while *visaṃvādana* and *visaṃvādayitar* are said to be derivatives from *visaṃvādeti*.

It is difficult to see why the editors of PED should restrict the use of this prefix *visaṃ* to the verb *vādeti* and its derivatives, since an equivalent *visaṃ* is also found in *visaṃyutta*, *visaṃyoga*, *visaṃsaṭṭha*, and *visaṃhata*. It is, in fact, obvious that we are dealing here with the two prefixes *vi* and *sam*, and there is no reason whatsoever for seeing any connection with *viṣu*. The error of PED is all the more noticeable because the verb *visaṃvād-* and its derivatives, with the same meaning as in Pāli, exist in Skt (as well as in BHS, from which PED quotes it), and can easily be found in MW.

The erroneous note about *visaṃ* must therefore be removed from PED, and the etymologies based upon it corrected.

## 7. *vedhavera* 'one who preys upon widows'

PED lists this word (s.v.) with the meaning 'son of a widow'. It occurs in two passages in Ja:

*sukka-cchavī vedhaverā thullabāhū apaṭubhā mithubhedaṃ karissanti* (IV 184,22*)

and *sukka-cchavī* (so read for *-cchavi-*) *vedhaverā datvā subhagamānino akāmaṃ parikaḍḍhanti* (VI 508,13*)

In both places the commentary is not clear, and differs from edition to edition. For the first passage, Ee reads: *vedhaverā ti vidhavā apatikā, tehi vidhavā sarantī ti tividhaverā ca vedhaverā* (IV 185,19'). Ce reads: *vedhaverā ti vidhavā apatikā, tāhi vidhavāhi veraṃ carantī ti* (IV 181,10'). Be reads the same (IV 186,19'). In the case of Ce and Be it is clear that the commentary is making a 'folk etymology'; *vedhavera* is explained as being made from *vidhavā* and *vera* 'hostility towards widows'. The meaning of Ee is not clear, but the transcript[22] of the Trenckner reading of the Copenhagen MS is: *vedhaverā ti vidhavapatikā te hi vidhavā īranti ti (ti) vidhaverā ca (va?) vedhaverā*. This perhaps indicates a 'folk etymology' based upon *vidhavā* and *īra*. For the second passage, Ee reads: *vedhaverā ti vidhavitthakā* (VI 509,10') with the v.11 *-vitthikā* and *vidhavittikāmā purisā*. Ce reads: *vedhaverā ti vidhavitthikā* (VII 447,29'). Be reads: *vedhaverā ti vidhavitthikāmā purisā* (VII 278,20').

PED took the meaning 'son of a widow' from Childers,[23] who gave it on the authority of Senart's edition[24] of Kaccāyana (K 389 = V.6). Kaccāyana derived it from Skt *vaidhaveya*, with the ending *-era* replacing Skt *-eya*, cf. Skt *śrāmaṇeya* with Pāli *sāmaṇera*.[25] The same explanation is given by Moggallāna (IV.4). R. Morris, however, pointed out[26] that the meaning of Skt *vaidhaveya* does not fit the two Ja contexts. My attention has been drawn[27] to a letter written by Helmer Smith to Dines Andersen, in which he points out that Sadd gives two meanings for the suffix *-era*: one means *apacca* 'child', but the other has the sense *atthika* 'desirous of', e.g. *kaññera* and *vesiyera*, as well as *vedhavera*: *asaddhamma-sevanâdhippāyena vidhavâdīhi atthike jane abhidhātabbe vidhavâdito ṇera-paccayo hoti – vidhavāya atthiko vidhavero, evaṃ kaññero vesiyero* (784,23 – 785,2).

If this is so, then it seems likely that the gloss *vidhavitthikā* in Ee is an error for *vidhavatthikā*, while the gloss *vidhavitthikāmā* in Be represents a 'correction' of this by a scribe who

thought he saw the word *itthi* in the compound, and believed that the final *-kā* was an error for *-kāmā*. The v.l. *vidhavittikāmā* in Ee is perhaps a further corruption of this, but may possibly be a miswriting of *vidhava-vitti-kāmā* 'desiring a widow's wealth'.

## 8. *saṃghaṭṭanā* 'contact'

PED lists this word (s.v.) with two meanings: 'contact' and 'bracelet', although it queries the latter meaning. In a similar way it lists two separate words *saṃghaṭṭa*[1] and *saṃghaṭṭa*[2], giving them the meanings 'knocking against' and 'bangle' respectively. The authority for the meaning of *saṃghaṭṭa*[2] seems to be the word division *saṃghaṭṭa-yantāni* in Sn 48 as it is printed in the Ee of Nidd II (61,22), although PED rightly states that this is simply an alternative reading for *saṃghaṭṭamānāni*, which is the reading of Ee at Sn 48, without v.l. The latter word is the present middle participle of *saṃghaṭṭati* (not of *saṃghaṭṭeti*, as PED says). The word division adopted in Nidd II is misleading. It should have been printed as *saṃghaṭṭayantāni*, which is the present participle active of *saṃghaṭṭayati = saṃghaṭṭeti*.

The word *saṃghaṭṭanā* occurs at Pj II 96,13 (ad Sn 48), which states: *bhujasmiṃ gaṇavāse sati saṃghaṭṭanā, ekavāse aghaṭṭanā* – 'When there is a group (of bracelets) on the arm, there is contact. When there is only one, there is no contact'. It is hard to see how the editors of PED could imagine that *saṃghaṭṭanā* could mean 'bracelet' here. In the phrase *saṃghaṭṭana-valayam ārammaṇaṃ katvā* (Ja III 378,11) the word *saṃghaṭṭana* is an adjective: 'the clashing bracelet'.

PED lists only forms coming from *saṃghaṭṭeti*, and *ghaṭṭenti* and *saṃghaṭṭenti* occur in Nidd II (61,32) in the exegesis on Sn 48. The present participle occurs at Ja III 378,4: *dve valayāni aññamaññaṃ saṃghaṭṭentāni*. PED also lists *saṃghaṭṭiyati* from Vv-a 139,26, and states that it is the present passive. This is belied by the context, which requires an active form, as is recognised by the editor who writes:[28] '*saṃghaṭṭiyati*, to provoke by scoffing (one expects *-ṭṭeti* or

*-ṭṭāyati*' [this latter form is perhaps an error for *-ṭṭayati*]). We can therefore conclude that the ending *-iyati* is indeed an active form, and is a palatalised variation of *-ayati = -eti*.[29]

There is, however, also evidence for the existence of *saṃghaṭṭati*. Besides the present participle middle in *-amāna* mentioned above, the present indicative occurs at Ja III 378,7: *aññamaññaṃ saṃghaṭṭanti*, while the present participle in *-anta* occurs at Vin III 208,30 = 209,2. The participle in *-amāna* is either a genuine middle form 'knocking against each other', or it could be a passive 'being knocked together', in which *-ṭṭ-* stands for *-ṭṭy-*.

The meaning 'bracelet' for *saṃghaṭṭanā* and the whole entry *saṃghaṭṭa*[2] should be removed from PED.

## 9. *satipaṭṭhāna* 'the raising up of mindfulness'

PED seems to be uncertain about the etymology of this compound (s.v. *sati*). Attention is drawn to the BHS equivalent *smṛty-upasthāna*, but no comment is made. The statement is, however, made (s.v. *paṭṭhāna*) that the word occurs only in the compound *sati-paṭṭhāna*, and no mention is made (s.v. *upaṭṭhāna*) that the word may be compounded with *sati*. Similarly, CPD (s.v. *upaṭṭhāna*) makes no reference to this possibility.

This seems strange in view of the fact that Childers draws attention[30] to the BHS form and specifically states that *satipaṭṭhāna* is for *sati-upaṭṭhāna*. He quotes *bhikkhunipassaya* (< *bhikkhunī-upassaya*) as another example of the same *sandhi* formation.[31] He draws attention to the occurrence of the phrase *upaṭṭhitā sati*, and the compound *upaṭṭhita-sati*, and could have mentioned the frequent use of *satiṃ* with various forms of the verb *upaṭṭhāpeti*.

In his translation of the Mahāsatipaṭṭhānasutta, T. W. Rhys Davids comments[32] upon the etymology of *satipaṭṭhāna*, and notes the Buddhaghosa knew both the etymology from *upaṭṭhāna* and that from *paṭṭhāna*, but seemed to prefer the latter. It is not clear why Buddhaghosa should have done so, since he knew and quoted[33] the phrase from Paṭis I 177,33 =

II 232,20: *kāyo upaṭṭhānaṃ no sati, sati upaṭṭhānañ c' eva sati ca* – 'The body is the establishment (foundation), but it is not the mindfulness. Mindfulness is both the establishment (foundation) and the mindfulness'.[34]

Childers quotes only the neuter form *satipaṭṭhānaṃ*, but Rhys Davids notes[35] that in the Mahāsatipaṭṭhānasutta it always masculine: *cattāro satipaṭṭhānā* (D II 290,11 foll.) and *cattāro satipaṭṭhāne eva bhāveyya* (314,11 foll.). On the other hand it is clearly neuter in Vibh: *idaṃ vuccati satipaṭṭhānaṃ* (203,8 foll.).

Unless we are to see here an example of a compound having two genders, the most likely explanation of the apparent change of gender is that the neuter forms are *tatpuruṣa* compounds: 'the raising up (or establishment) of mindfulness', while the masculine forms are adjectives: 'having mindfulness as their foundation', in agreement with an unstated noun. It is not obvious what this could be, but it is perhaps *dhamma* 'mental state'.

## 10. *sammasitā* 'having grasped'

The word *sammasitā*, in the stem form *sammasitar*, is listed in PED (s.v.) with the meaning 'one who grasps, sees clearly'. The editors are therefore taking the suffix *-tā* as the nominative of a *-tar* agent noun stem. The word occurs only at Sn 69 = Ap 12,11: *ādīnavaṃ sammasitā bhavesu*, which is presumably to be taken as meaning 'the seer of dangers in existences'. It is not impossible that this should be so, since there are many examples of agent nouns being constructed with accusatives as the direct object, e.g. *kathaṃ kattā hoti*, M III 111,15 = A IV 233,35; *bhayaṃ apanuditā*, D III 148,2; *rakkhâvaraṇa-guttiṃ saṃvidhātā*, D III 148,2; *vācaṃ bhāsitā*, D III 175,7; *sakapurisaṃ ubbejetā*, A II 109,11; *aññe asse ubbejetā*, A IV 189,1; *bandhaṃ mocetā*, Paṭis I 128,16. The phrase 'seeing danger in . . . ' is, however, a very common phrase in Pāli, and we should usually expect either a finite verb, a participle, or an absolutive.

Among the verses attributed to the Pratyekabuddhas in

the Mvu are two which, although not completely parallel to Sn 69, do include references to *ādīnava*. In both cases (Mvu I 359,2,6) the verb is *saṃmṛśanto*. Pj II 123,19 = Ap-a 197,3 includes *samanupassanto* in the exegesis. Nidd II makes no comment upon *sammasitā*, and gives no v.1., but surprisingly the version of Sn printed at the beginning of Nidd II includes the form *sammasitvā* (70,21), although it does not give any authority for the reading, nor does it list any v.11. Since it seems inconceivable that none of the MSS available to the editor included the reading *-tā*, which is the only reading found in the other editions of Sn and Nidd II, it seems very likely that this is a misprint. It is, however, helpful, perhaps quite unintentionally, in that it suggests an interpretation of *sammasitā*.

The metre of Sn 69 is *Triṣṭubh*, and the first three syllables of *sammasitā* occur in the portion of the *pāda* (the 'break') where a dactyl is most usually found. It is probable that, if the original form of the word had had a long third syllable, this would have been shortened m.c., if it were at all possible. It is not likely that the consonant cluster *-tv-* (if this had been the original reading) would have been shortened to *-t-*, but it is not at all unreasonable to presume that *-tt-* might have been simplified to *-t-*, since examples of the simplification of doubled consonants are not hard to find.[36] If this suggestion is correct, then the original form of the word could have been *sammasittā*, which would then have been an absolutive, which would replicate well the common construction *ādīnavaṃ disvā*.

It is, however, important to note that if this were so, then we have another example of an absolutive in *-ttā*, and another example of a form being taken over from a dialect which had such absolutive forms. Professor von Hinüber has given examples[37] of some forms of this kind, but an exact parallel to this usage of *sammasitā*, with the simplification of *-tt-* > *-t-* m.c. elsewhere in Sn has been pointed out by the present writer.[38] At Sn 537 the word *parivajjayitā* occurs in an *Aupacchandasaka* verse. Pj II 434,11 has, however, *paribbājayitvā* in the lemma, and glosses it as *nikkhametvā niddhametvā*, i.e. as an absolutive. Again, *it is clear that the*

cluster -*tv*- would not have been shortened, but -*tt*- could be. The fact that the absolutive was not an invention of the Pāli commentator is shown by the existence of the word *parivarjayitvā* in the BHS version of the verse (Mvu III 400,13*).

This is additional evidence for the belief that some, if not all, of the Pāli canon existed earlier in a dialect where the absolutive ending was -*ttā*, and the Pāli redactors changed -*ttā* into -*tvā* wherever they realised that -*ttā* was an absolutive ending. Where -*ttā* was ambiguous, so too was their treatment of it. I have elsewhere mentioned *chettā* at Th 1263,[39] where some editions read *chetvā*. It is clear that the version available to the commentator had -*ttā*, since he glosses: *chettā chedako* (Th-a III 199, 11–12), i.e. as an agent noun.

There is evidence that there must have been a similar confusion about the word *kattā*, which could be interpreted as both *kattā* (< Skt *kartā*) and *katvā* (< Skt *kṛtvā*) in one and the same *pāda* when it occurred in different places. At Ja II 317,13*–14* we find: *āpāsu me yuddhaparājitassa/ekassa katvā vivanasmi ghore*. This is glossed: *katvā ti anukampaṃ karitvā* (317,21′–22′). At Ja IV 274,1*–2* we find: *ayaṃ migo kicchagatassa mayhaṃ/ekassa kattā vivanasmiṃ ghore*, with the gloss: *kattā kārako jīvitassa dāyako* (274,8′–9′). It is noteworthy that the commentarial tradition of a single text could continue to transmit different forms and interpretations of what had originally been the same word. In the case of *sammasitā*, once -*tt*- had become -*t*- m.c. all idea of it having once been an absolutive was lost.

Professor von Hinüber has commented[40] upon the way in which the construction of an agent noun with the verb *abhijānāti* has arisen (incorrectly), in circumstances where an agent noun in -*tā* would seem to make sense, as well as the absolutive which is the correct construction. It is important to note that the examples he discusses, and those mentioned above, show that some (if not all) absolutives in the Pāli canon were at one time found with the ending -*ttā*, which was changed to -*tvā* by the Pāli redactors. This does not, in itself, prove that Pāli was an artificial literary language, since Pāli might have been a genuine Middle Indo-Aryan dialect which

had an absolutive form in -*tvā*. To prove that it was an artificial literary language we must prove that there was no dialect with a -*tvā* form in existence at the time when the Pāli canon was formed.

CAMBRIDGE                                    K. R. NORMAN

## Notes

1 For previous articles in this series see: K. R.. Norman, 'Two Pali Etymologies', in *BSOAS* XLII, 1979, pp. 321–28; K. R. Norman, 'Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XV: Nine Pāli Etymologies', in *JOI(B)* XXIX, 1979, pp. 42–49.

2 Abbreviations are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48 (= CPD). In addition: BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Skt; G Dhp = Gāndhārī Dharmapada; Be = Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition; Ce = Simon Hewavitarne Bequest edition; Ee = PTS edition.

3 See K. R. Norman, 'The dialects in which the Buddha preached', in H. Bechert (ed.), *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen 1980.

4 Ud-a p. 415, n. 2.

5 Spk I p. 279, n. 1.

6 Sadd Index p. 1379, s.v. *cuṇṇa*.

7 MW p. 401, s.v. *cūrṇa*.

8 *ibid.*, s.v. *cūrṇaka*.

9 Sadd p. 1108, §1.3.2.

10 W. H. D. Rouse, *Jātaka Translation*, Vol. IV, Cambridge 1901, p. 155.

10a See H. Lüders, 'Skt *kaḍāra-viklidha*', in *AO* 16 (1938), pp. 131–45 (= *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden 1973, pp. 89–103).

11 F. L. Woodward, *Minor Anthologies*, Vol. II, London 1935, p. 27.

12 E. W. Burlingame, *Buddhist Legends*, Part I, Harvard 1921, p. 221.

13 So Be and Ce.

14 Ud p. 22, n. 6.

15 MW p. 905, s.v. *lūṣ-*.

16 T. Burrow, 'Skt *lubh-* "to disturb"', in *JRAS* 1956, pp. 191–200.

17 H. T. Francis and R. A. Neil, *Jātaka Translation*, Vol. III, Cambridge 1897, p. 204.

18 'When life is coming to an end and death's hour draws anigh' (*Jātaka Translation*, Vol. II, p. 35 = Vol. IV, p. 265).

19 Letter dated 24 January 1912, kept in the archives of the CPD in Copenhagen, and made available to me by Mrs Else Pauly.

20 *op. cit.* (in n. 17), p. 167, n. 1.

21 cf. Abh 663: *vālukā vannu.*

22 Made available to me by Mrs Else Pauly.

23 R. C. Childers, *Dictionary of the Pāli Language*, London 1875, p. 562,
s.v. *vedhavero.*

24 É. Senart, *JAs* 1871, pp. 1–339.

25 See W. Geiger, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*, Strassburg 1916, §46.3.

26 R. Morris, 'Notes and Queries', in *JPTS* 1891–93, p. 7.

27 Letter dated 31 January 1934. See note 19 above.

28 Vv-a p. 369.

29 See K. R. Norman, 'Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XIII: The palatalisation
of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan', in *JOI(B)* XXV, 1976, pp. 328–42.

30 *op. cit.* (in n. 23), p. 466, s.v. *satipaṭṭhānaṃ.*

31 It occurs as a v.1. for *bhikkhunī-passaya* at A II 144,32.

32 T. W. Rhys Davids, *Dialogue of the Buddha*, Part II, London 1910, p.
324.

33 Sv 753,1–2 etc.

34 Translated by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli, *The Path of Discrimination*, London
1982, p. 178 = p. 398.

35 *op. cit.* (in n. 32), p. 324.

36 See K. R. Norman, *Elders' Verses* I, London 1969, §41 and *Elders'
Verses* II, London 1971, §65.

37 O. von Hinüber, 'Pāli as an artificial language', in *Ind. Taur.* X, 1982,
pp. 133–40.

38 K. R. Norman, 'Four Etymologies from the Sabhiya-sutta', in *Buddhist
Studies in honour of Walpola Rahula*, London 1980, p. 183, n. 21.

39 K. R. Norman, *Elders' Verses* I, London 1969, p. 297 (ad Th 1263).

40 *op. cit.* (in n. 37), p. 136.

WHERE'S THAT SUTTA?


A guide to the

Discourses

in the Numerical Collection

(Anguttara-nikāya)

listing subjects, similes, persons and places

by

Ven. Bhikkhu Khantipalo